

On December 22, 1913, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

3357. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 36 Cans of Misbranded Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 5356. I. S. Nos. 1538-h, 1539-h. S. No. 1961.)

On October 17, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 case containing 36 $\frac{1}{2}$ -gallon and $\frac{1}{4}$ -gallon cans of oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New Haven, Conn., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about September 18, 1913, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Olive Oil—Specialty—From Lucca (pictorial representations of coat of arms, queens, etc.) Lucca Olive Oil—L. Natalini. Net contents 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ oz."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was not olive oil, but that instead it consisted in large part of cottonseed oil which had been mixed and packed with and substituted for olive oil in such manner as to reduce or lower the quality of the product. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that said retail packages were labeled: "Olive Oil Specially [Specialty] from Lucca," when in truth and in fact said retail packages did not contain olive oil, but contained a product consisting largely of cottonseed oil which had been mixed and packed with and substituted for olive oil.

On December 22, 1913, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

3358. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 96 Cans of Misbranded Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 5357. I. S. No. 1541-h. S. No. 1961.)

On October 17, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 case containing 48 pint cans of oil and another case containing 48 other cans of oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New Haven, Conn., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about June 30, 1913, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The cans in one of the cases were labeled: "Olive Oil—Specialty—From Lucca (pictorial representations of coat of arms, queens, etc.) Lucca Olive Oil—L. Natalini Brand;" the cans in the other case were labeled: "(Pictorial representations of medals of award) Net contents 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ oz. Baron del Bosco (Crown and shield bearing picture of bear and lion)—Italy—Extra Fine—Olive Oil—Guaranteed absolutely pure—M. Beneventano, Del Bosco, Sole Agent, 212 Lafayette St., New York."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that the product was not olive oil, but that instead it consisted in large part of cottonseed oil which had been mixed and packed with and substituted for olive oil in such manner as to reduce or lower the quality of the product. Mis-

branding was alleged for the reason that the retail packages in one of the cases were labeled: "Olive Oil Specially [Specialty] from Lucca," and the retail packages in the other case were labeled: "Extra Fine—Olive Oil—Guaranteed Absolutely Pure," when in truth and in fact said retail packages did not contain olive oil, but contained a product consisting largely of cottonseed oil which had been mixed and packed with and substituted for olive oil.

On December 22, 1913, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

3359. Adulteration and misbranding of oil of sweet birch. U. S. v. 2 Cans of Oil of Sweet Birch. Tried to the court and a jury. Verdict for libelant. Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 5369. I. S. No. 2336-h. S. No. 1968.)

On October 24, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 2 cans of oil of sweet birch, more or less, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the product had been transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Muth Bros. & Co., Baltimore, Md. From M. G. Teaster."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that methyl salicylate had been mixed and packed with and substituted for oil of sweet birch in such manner as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality and strength, and for the further reason that said oil of sweet birch had been colored in a manner to conceal inferiority. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was sold as oil of sweet birch, when in fact it consisted of a mixture containing methyl salicylate.

On March 2, 1914, the case having come on for trial before the court and a jury, a verdict for the libelant was returned by the jury, and on April 3, 1914, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

3360. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. 15 Cases, More or Less, of So-called Pure Cider Vinegar, and 37 Cases, More or Less, of So-called Pure Sugar Vinegar. Default decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 5397. I. S. Nos. 81-h, 82-h. S. No. 1989.)

On November 1, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 15 cases, more or less, each containing 1 dozen bottles of so-called pure cider vinegar, and 37 cases, more or less, each containing 2 dozen bottles of so-called pure sugar vinegar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Kans., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about September 17, 1913, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Kansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The 15 cases and the bottles therein contained were labeled: "Paragon Brand Pure Cider Vinegar—Put up by Kansas City Preserving Co., Kansas City, Mo." The 37 cases and the bottles therein contained were labeled: "Paragon Brand Pure Sugar Vinegar—Put up by Levi-